

REMARKS

This communication is in response to the Office Action issued June 1, 2006. Claims 1-8 and 10-24 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 11, 12, 17 and 21 have been amended for clarity. Reconsideration and allowance in view of the following is respectfully requested.

A. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

At pages 2-6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7 and 17-19 as being unpatentable over Screenshots from www.iwul.edu/~lshapiro, via Web Archive (www.archive.org/web/*/http://www.iwu.edu/~lshapiro), December 06, 1998 (Screenshots) and further in view of US patent 5581677 issued to Myers et al. For at least the reasons stated below, the Applicant submits that the Examiner's rejection has been traversed.

Claim 1 now recites, inter alia, instructions to simultaneously display the first chart and the second chart and replace the second chart with the third chart is stored on the web page as one continuous stream of markup language page is stored on the web page as one continuous stream of markup language. For example, instructions are provided in a markup language and stored on a computer readable medium. The instructions are executable by a rendering agent to display a first chart and a second chart simultaneously on a web page and set a plurality of active area on the first chart that are responsive to events. When an event is detected in the first chart, the second chart on the web page is replaced with a third chart on the same web page using markup language contained within the page when it was displaying the first and the second chart. All of the markup language instructions to display the first, second and third chart is contained in a continuous stream of markup language within the web page display the three charts.

In contrast, Screenshot teaches a mechanism for displaying multiple distinct web

pages in a single browser window using a technique called framing. In Screenshots a technique call vertical framing is implemented. The figures provided by the Examiner are contained within a browser window that includes html markup language frameset tag instructions that define how to divide the browser window into frames where the frameset tag instructions defines a set of column frames. The html markup language frameset tag instructions for the browser window can be viewed by selecting the menu option view in the menu bar of the browser when viewing figure 1 and selecting the menu option source from the view menu. The values of the columns indicate the amount of screen area each column will occupy.

In figure 1 of the Examiners example, item 1 is its own distinct web page having its own html markup language instructions to render item 1 and item 2 is its own distinct web page having its own html markup language instructions to render item 2. The html markup language instructions for rendering item 1 can be viewed by placing the cursor over item 1 of figure 1 and right clicking the mouse to render a window of options that includes a view source option. The selection of this option will display the markup language instructions for the web page of item 1. Likewise, if the examiner places his cursor over item 2 of figure 1 and performs the same action, the markup language instructions for the web page of item 2 will be displayed. By performing the aforementioned steps it becomes clear that the markup language instructions for items 1 and item 2 are contained within the same browser window, but not within the same web page as a continuous stream of markup language instructions. Instead the markup language instructions for items 1 and 2 are within two distinct web pages displayed in a browser window. Further evidence that the figures use a framing technique is that they can be independently navigated using scroll bars. Accordingly, the Screenshots fails to disclose providing instructions in a markup language, simultaneously displaying the first chart and the second chart on “a web page,” setting a plurality of active regions on the first chart wherein each active region is responsive to an event and performs an action in response to the event and replacing the second chart with a third chart so as to

simultaneously the first chart and a third chart on the web page; wherein the instructions in the markup language is generated based on chart content information and chart styling information for the first chart, the second chart and the third chart and stored on the web page.

Also, as correctly acknowledged in the Office Action on pages 3, Screenshots fails to disclose displaying charts. Myers fails to cure this deficiency of Screenshot addressed above. Like Screenshots, Myers fails to disclose providing instructions to simultaneously display the first chart and the second chart and replace the second chart with the third chart is stored on the web page as one continuous stream of markup language page is stored on the web page as one continuous stream of markup language. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that at least these features are not taught or suggested by any combination of the cited references, and thus the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, claims 2-7 are not taught or suggested for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 17 recites language substantially similar to claim 1, and thus is not taught or suggested for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 18 and 19 depend from claim 17. Accordingly, claims 18 and 19 are not taught or suggested for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 17.

The Examiner rejected claims 8, 10-12 and 20-22 as being unpatentable over Screenshots from www.iwul.edu/~lshapiro, via Web Archive (www.archive.org/web/*/http://www.iwu.edu/~lshapiro), December 06, 1998 (Screenshots) and Myers et al. in further view of US patent publication application 2002/0052891 issued to Michaud.

As discussed above the combination of Screenshots and Myers fails to disclose the limitations recited by claims 1 and 17. Michaud, like Myers, fails to cure the deficiencies of Screenshots. Claims 8, 10, and 20 depend from claim 1 and 17 respectively, and thus are not taught for the same reasons stated above with respect to claims 1 and 17.

Claims 11 and 12 now recites limitation similar to claim 1. For example, the instructions for rendering a web page that displays a first chart and a second as well as the first chart and the third chart in response to an event are all stored on the web page. The instructions for the action (i.e., replacing the second chart with the third chart) to be performed when the user interacts (i.e., performs an event on the web page) with the web page is also stored as one continuous stream of markup language on the web page.

As discussed above the combination of Screenshots and Myers fails to disclose the limitations of providing instructions for displaying the different charts in a single web page. Screenshots provides multiple web pages in a single window each web page having its own instructions to render the page. Neither Michaud or Myers cures the deficiencies of Screenshots. Accordingly, The combination of Screenshots, Myers and Michaud fails to teach or suggest the invention of claim 11.

Claim 12 recites limitations similar to claim 11, and thus, is not taught or suggested for the reasons stated with respect to claim 11.

Claim 21 recites limitations similar to claim 12, and thus, is not taught or suggested for the reasons stated with respect to claim 12.

Claim 22 depends from claim 21, and thus, is not taught or suggested for the reasons stated with respect to claim 21.

The Examiner rejected claims 13-16 as being unpatentable over Screenshots from
www.iwul.edu/~lshapiro, via Web Archive
(www.archive.org/web/*/http://www.iwu.edu/~lshapiro), December 06, 1998

(Screenshots) and Myers et al., Michaud in further view of Priester.

As discussed above the combination of Screenshots, Myers and Michaud fails to disclose the limitations recited by claim 1. Priester, like Myers and Michaud, fails to cure the deficiencies of Screenshots. Claims 13-16 depend from claim 1, and thus are not taught for the same reasons stated above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 23 and 24 depend from claim 1 and are not teach or suggested for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

B. Conclusion

All claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions about this amendment and to facilitate prosecution, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned attorney. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 19-5127 referencing 19111.0200.

Respectfully submitted,

Bingham McCutchen LLP

Dated: October 2, 2006

By: 

Chadwick A. Jackson
Registration No. 46,495

Bingham McCutchen LLP
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20007
(202) 424-7500